

REMARKS

Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-4, 6, 11-12, 16 and 18-19 stand rejected under §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Furuwari et al. (JP 11-142841).

Claims 5, 10 and 17 stand rejected under §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Furuwari et al. in view of Shiotani et al. (JP 2001-338512).

Claims 7 and 13 stand rejected under §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Furuwari et al. in view of Nakano (US 2003/0053008).

Claims 8, 14 and 20 stand rejected under §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Furuwari et al. in view of Matsuda et al. (US 2002/0167626).

Claims 9 and 15 stand rejected under §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Furuwari et al. in view of Lee et al. (US 2001/0003471).

Claim 13 stands rejected under §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Furuwari et al. and Shiotani et al. further in view of Nakano.

Claim 14 stands rejected under §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Furuwari et al. and Shiotani et al. further in view of Matsuda et al.

Claim 15 stands rejected under §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Furuwari et al. and Shiotani et al. further in view of Lee et al.

Claims 19 and 20 stand objected to because of minor informalities.

Summary of Amendment

Claims 19 and 20 have been amended to correct the typographical errors indicated in the Office Action. No new matter has been entered. Claims 1-20 are pending for further consideration.

Claim Objections

Claim 19 and 20 stand objected to because of minor informalities. Applicant has amended claims 19 and 20 as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the claim be withdrawn.

All Claims Comply With §102 and §103

Claims 1-4, 6, 11-12, 16 and 18-19 stand rejected under §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Furuwari et al. Further, claims 5, 7-10, 13-15, 17, and 20 stand rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Furuwari et al. in various combinations of Shiotani et al., Nakano, Matsuda et al., and Lee et al. Applicant traverses these rejections for the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 recites, in part, “a bottom cover having an end portion that *substantially surrounds the reflection sheet to encase the reflection sheet.*” (Emphasis added.)

Independent claim 11 recites, in part, “an end portion of the bottom cover extends to the outer side of the reflection sheet *to substantially surround and encase the reflection sheet.*”

(Emphasis added.) Independent claim 18 recites, in part, “a bottom cover along a rear side of the reflection plate having an end portion *that substantially surrounds the reflection sheet to encase the reflection sheet.*” (Emphasis added.) None of the reference teaches or suggests at

least these features. As claims 2-10, 12-17, 19, and 20 also depend from one of the independent claims 1, 11, and 18, Furuwari et al., Shiotani et al., Nakano, Matsuda et al., and Lee et al., whether taken individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the features of claims 1-20. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the §102 and §103 rejections be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Dated: August 14, 2006

By: 

Kyle J. Choi

Reg. No. 41,480

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
Customer No.: 009626
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202.739.3000
Facsimile: 202.739.3001